



# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Los Angeles County  
Board of Supervisors

Gloria Molina  
Yvonne Burke  
Zev Yaroslavsky  
Don Knabe  
Michael D. Antonovich, Mayor

2006

## PUBLIC MEMBERS

### First District

Vacant  
Vacant

### Second District

Paula G. Leftwich  
John O. Murrell

### Third District

Lucy T. Eisenberg, Esq., Chair  
Janice Kamenir-Reznik, Esq.

### Fourth District

Jean F. Cohen  
Maria C. Tortorelli, Esq.

### Fifth District

Reginald Brass  
Susan Speir, Vice Chair

## GOVERNMENT MEMBERS

### Chief Information Office

Jon W. Fullinwider

### Department of

Children and Family Services  
Dr. David Sanders

### Department of

Public Social Services  
Bryce Yokomizo

### Child Support Services

Department  
Philip Browning

### Los Angeles Superior Court

David Jetton

## EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

### California Department of

Child Support Services  
Mary Lawrence

### Franchise Tax Board

## CHILD SUPPORT ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES

### NOVEMBER 30, 2006

### Present

2<sup>nd</sup> District, John Murrell  
3<sup>rd</sup> District, Chair Lucy T. Eisenberg,  
Esq.  
4<sup>th</sup> District, Jean Cohen  
5<sup>th</sup> District, Reginald Brass  
5<sup>th</sup> District, Susan Speir  
CA Department of Child Support  
Services, Ms. Lawrence  
Children and Family Services,  
Sue Harper  
Superior Court,  
David Jetton  
Child Support Services  
Steve Golightly

### Guests

Wayne Doss	CSSD
Patricia Tellechea	CSSD
Ms. Paik	CSSD
Ms. Juiliano	CSSD
Emy Tzimoulis	CSSD
Ms. Cruz	CSSD
Sylvia Valencia	DPSS

### Staff

Jim Corbett	Board of Supervisors
Gabriel Alexander	Board of Supervisors
Melena Taylor	Board of Supervisors

### Absent

2<sup>nd</sup> District, Paula Leftwich  
3<sup>rd</sup> District, Janice Kamenir-Reznik  
4<sup>th</sup> District, Maria Tortorelli  
  
Chief Information Office,  
Fred Nazarbegian

## CALL TO ORDER

Chair Eisenberg called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m. in room 743 of the Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration.

**APPROVE MINUTES OF October 26, 2006**

Member Cohen requested the following corrections to page 8 of the minutes:

Member Jean Cohen stated... the state program that assist working families  
(*Healthy Families Program*) who do not qualify...

On motion of Vice Chair Speir, seconded by Mr. Jetton and carried  
unanimously, the minutes for October 26, 2006 were approved.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT- To include: An update on State Disbursement  
Unit: an update on statewide allocation- Steven Golightly**

Mr. Golightly provided the director's report on behalf of Mr. Phillip Browning; he  
reported that:

- For the first time in 16 years there is no longer a contractual agreement  
with ACS or Lockheed Martin. The department is transitioning to a new  
division referred to as the Customer Financial Services Division which  
will handle all issues related to local concerns of allocation and  
disbursement of checks
- The state disbursement unit and the state automation system (SWS) are  
performing well. There is a 0.03 suspense rate (211 cases, as of  
November 29, 2006) with the goal being to have an ongoing rate is 0.02;  
Mr. Golightly notes that this is an impressive figure given the volume of  
payments (7500) that come through office daily.
- The Customer Financial Services Division is divided into two operations:
  1. 13 central financial workers
  2. 23 members of the collection distribution and review team

(Member Cohen joined the meeting at 9:45 am)

The total number of employees in the division is 45. There are currently  
three cashier positions that need to be filled.

- Mr. Golightly stated that given all of the changes that have occurred,  
including the advent of the State Disbursement Unit (SDU) in May, the  
division has operated at a level that was better than what was projected.

- There is an average of 30-50 email requests requesting assistance with checks and 10-20 calls requesting help for SDU related work from Sacramento each day.

Vice Chair Speir raised a question about the methods of payment for non custodial parents. Vice Chair Speir related that a client of hers tried to submit a payment through Western Union online, but the SDU was not listed as payment option; the client paid LA County who in turn sent the payment to the SDU thereby delaying the payment by 4 days. Vice Chair Speir inquires as to who holds the responsibility to contact Western Union to inform them that payments should be directed to the SDU.

Mr. Golightly agreed that the payment system is not efficient. Mr. Golightly informed the Board that Western Union will be replaced with Bank of America in 2007 and that the state is responsible for alerting Western Union in the meantime that funds are to be sent to the SDU.

- There are 211 items in suspense. These 211 items are cases that are being processed through the state as a new category of money (CDRT). In response to Chair Eisenberg's inquiry about data previously reviewed by CSAB as it relates to money on hold, Ms. Paik stated that the CDRT list is money that is on hold and that the data is still available.

Mr. Golightly clarified this issue: when money goes into suspense, the goal is to release the money and to investigate where it belongs in a timely manner. If that investigation yields no results, the money is then placed in a hold category which is subjected to more intense research (CDRT).

- Over the past few months the state has been working to notify customers that child support checks should be sent to the SDU in Sacramento. Approximately 50% of the mail that should be directed to Sacramento is still being sent to the Los Angeles office. Mail is being transported to Sacramento through the Southwest Airlines courier service. Mr. Golightly endorsed a more aggressive marketing campaign in conjunction with DCSS to remind customers about the new mailing address for payments.

Vice Chair Speir stated that the letter sent to non custodial parents is unclear and convoluted with too much information. Vice Chair Speir suggested creating a letter that plainly states that payments should be sent to the SDU. Ms. Lawrence agreed to pass that suggestion along.

- Mr. Golightly called attention to a Los Angeles Times article regarding

the operation of child support services in Los Angeles county.

- An Employee Town Hall will take place December 11, 2006. The forum is held twice a year and will be an opportunity for Mr. Philip Browning to get an update on departmental activities and to hold a Q &A with the staff.
- The CCW tour is rescheduled to December 14, 2006. The tour will take place at the CCW courthouse beginning at 1:30 PM. Flyers were provided.

Chair Eisenberg asked for an update regarding statewide funding allocation. Mr. Golightly reported that there were no changes to the current year's allocation that was released in August of 2006. The formula that determines the allocation of collection improvement money is in still place and will continue going forward.

**DCSS Report: To include: COAP pilot for arrears of less than \$5000; health insurance initiatives; New Hire registry: status of policy letter regarding welfare referrals- Mary Lawrence**

Ms. Lawrence reported that:

- COAP (the pilot program for arrears) was offered to several counties (LCSAs) beginning May 2006; data from the program is still being collected and training is being provided to the LCSAs. Participation has been minimal on this project, which is an issue that is being addressed.

Kim Porter reported on health insurance initiatives:

- Ms. Porter provided an update on medical insurance regulations currently being proposed: The federal government released draft regulations on September 28<sup>th</sup>, 2006- the focus is geared towards making it the responsibility of either or both parents to obtain accessible and affordable health coverage for the children.
  - It is proposed that reasonable cost should constitute no more than 5% of the parent's gross income
  - The proposed hierarchy for employers to use if the parent's salary is insufficient to pay both current and medical support is as follows (beginning with the top priority): 1) current child support/ spousal support; 2) health insurance premiums/ cash medical; 3) arrears; 4) other cost (including interest payments). According to the November 20, 2006 meeting, regulations may become effective in the fall of 2007.

- Chair Eisenberg asked if any proposals are being discussed regarding how health insurance reporting should be handled by local agencies. Ms. Lawrence replied that she believes that there are proposals being discussed for new federal performance measures. These performance measures are being discussed at the state and federal level and are not expected to be in place until a year or two.

Mr. Kevin Smith reported on the New Hire Registry:

- There are two New Hire Registries. The state registry is managed by EDD on behalf of DCSS. The second is the national directory of new hires
- EDD identifies employers who don't report new hires when information is received on the quarterly wages of an employee that hadn't previously been reported. An outreach program is in place to notify employers of their obligation to report; Mr. Smith states that when employers are made aware of this responsibility most become compliant. Employers who do not report are not charged a fine.

Vice Chair Speir inquired as to whether there is a way to tell how many employers are not reporting. Mr. Smith replied that there is not.

Vice Chair Speir stated that it is necessary to research the reasons behind the abundance of incorrect information coming from the New Hire Registry. Vice Chair Speir's previous experience as the chair of the wage assignment committee led her to discover that bad information was responsible for around 40% of the wage assignments that were not working. Mr. Smith attributes the incorrect information to the fact that the EDD is instructed to enter only what is written on New Hire Registry form by the employer and there is no verification of addresses by the employer or EDD.

Chair Eisenberg stated that two issues with the New Hire Registry are 1) Information that included jobs never held by non custodial parents and 2) non-existent employers. Chair Eisenberg questions how information would include non-existent employers since employers are the reporting party? Mr. Smith requested specific examples in order to better answer the question. Ms. Juiliano agreed to resubmit the examples that were cited in 2005.

- Ms. Lawrence stated that there is no update on the status of the policy letter regarding welfare referrals. Two meetings have taken place without a final decision being reached on whether or not to issue a letter to impact all LCSAs or to give specific direction to Los Angeles County.

Ms. Lawrence stated that there was a misinterpretation of the letter which they are currently examining.

- Member Cohen voiced displeasure that they have been awaiting clarification since 2004 and that in order to proceed there is a need for a clarified policy. Ms. Lawrence promised to relay that information to the appropriate parties.

Janet Balou, DCSS attorney, presented:

- Ms. Balou is drafting a set of guideline calculator instructions to be posted on the DCSS website when version 2.1 is implemented. Ms. Balou is currently reviewing instructions to ensure clarity and that they are audience appropriate. Ms. Balou acknowledges that there is a limit to how accessible the instructions can be; she likens them to a tax form. Ms. Balou will send the instructions to Chair Eisenberg, Vice Chair Speir, Member Reginald Brass and Ms. Cruz for review and asked that after 30 days Chair Eisenberg compile and forward any comments.

Ms. Lawrence signed off at 10:18 AM at conclusion of state report.

### **REVIEW AND DISCUSS PERFORMANCE MEASURES- Gail Juiliano**

Chair Eisenberg addressed item 3 of the CSSD monthly report and asked whether or not there is a cut off number that would determine that performance is not adequate and that additional training is needed.

Ms. Julie Paik stated that that every Call Center employee has only been with the department for one year. Mr. Golightly noted that there is a high turnover due to new hires which allow veteran employees already to transfer to other departments. The influx of new employees is correlated with an increase in errors made, but there is a continual training process in place.

Ms. Paik informed Chair Eisenberg that the Policy division provides the initial 6 week training for new employees and is followed by 2 week Call Center training. A mentor and monitoring process is also in place to for quality assurance purposes.

Chair Eisenberg asked about the possibility of monitoring whether or not cases are being properly referred to the divisions from the Call Center. Ms. Emy Tzimoulis has data that can illustrate the appropriateness of and types of referrals

Chair Eisenberg inquired as to why collections decreased in 2006 as compared to 2005. Ms. Juiliano stated that the percentage the collections decreased was insignificant and attributed the decline due to the fact that arrears haven't been a top priority in the department.

Chair Eisenberg requested that in a future meeting the Board be provided with the information that is sent to non custodial parents regarding arrears and methods of payment. Ms. Juiliano stated that non custodial parents receive a pamphlet with general information and the information is available on the website but there is no routine exchange of information. Member Cohen suggested that along with the summons a one page document be issued that explains arrears and the consequences of missing payments, before arrears occur. Ms. Juiliano stated that there is a 25 page handbook that is distributed with the summons complaint, which Member Cohen proposed needs to be simplified. Continuing the discussion regarding arrears and the clarity of information given to non custodial parents, Mr. Golightly notes that the billing statement shows a past due amount plus current amount due, similar to a credit card bill.

Vice Chair Speir posed a question regarding arrears and wage assignments, providing the following example: Will a new wage assignment, including arrears payments, be automatically calculated for a person who lost their job and recently found new employment? Ms. Cruz stated that she would be able to address this question during her presentation after the conclusion of the performance measures discussion.

- Ms. Juiliano stated that the cumulative values reviewed in the "Number of Complaints Received/ Resolved/ Pending" section (number 5) of the monthly report could be eliminated to which there was no objection. Ms. Juiliano stated that at one point in time there was a significant backlog and these numbers were relevant; if another backlog occurs in the future, she will reinstate this review.

Data on order calculation method and new cases:

Ms. Juiliano and Chair Eisenberg agreed that the bar chart format with one month's data would suffice and every six month Ms. Juiliano will provide cumulative data.

Ms. Juiliano presented on the one month data chart of the order calculation method:

- The number of current child support reserved cases, totaling 23, should be smaller and represents a training issue

Vice Chair Speir voiced concerned about the high incidence of zero orders (31%). Ms. Juiliano stated that 31% was not particularly high, given that it includes TANF, SSI, GR and incarcerated persons, but that she would continue to monitor. Vice Chair Speir then asked whether orders are set at presumed and amend later. Ms. Juiliano stated that if there is no information in the case indicating GR or SSI, then the order will be set at presumed, with a possibility of amendment at a later date. In response to Vice Chair Speir's question about earnings orders and how many are amended at a later date, Ms. Juiliano stated that brand new orders are set at presumed if employment information is not found.

Chair Eisenberg requested to know the number of cases where new information on earnings has been received after the order was established. Ms. Cruz stated that when new income has been detected by the system there is a task in place that will alert a worker to modify their case. Ms. Juiliano stated that the task has only been in place a month and agreed to bring a report of that data at the next meeting.

**OVERVIEW OF WHAT HAPPENS TO AN OBLIGOR WHEN ARREARS ARE  
OWED AND ON PROCEDURES FOR ESTABLISHING A PAYMENT PLAN-  
Lori Cruz**

- Ms. Cruz began by addressing the issue of what happens when there are arrears in the system and no payment plan is in place.
  1. When current support is owed and no payment plan has been established, the system automatically calculates a plan based on 25% of the current support order.
  2. If arrears are owed, but no current support, the calculation is 1.7% of the arrears balance (including interest) owed.
- This calculation is communicated to the responsible party through the billing statement.

Chair Eisenberg commented that calculations requiring people to pay an amount above what has been determined as reasonable monthly payment is severe; Ms. Cruz replied that the calculations are according to state regulations and the department has no discretion in individual cases.

Vice Chair Speir offered that a significant issue needing to be examined by the department or the State is determining the appropriateness of reporting delinquents, when the payer is making the maximum allowable payment. Chair Eisenberg asked Ms. Cruz if non custodial parents have the option of



walking into a CSSD office and creating a payment plan for less than the 1.7% calculation, if no current support is owed, which Ms. Cruz confirmed is possible; a plan can be set up based on the non custodial parent's ability to pay.

- Current arrears: Ms. Cruz stated that this has not been a top priority and has received less attention; the department is implementing various initiatives to address arrears issues and increase collections. Ms. Cruz gave the example of a pilot program of one hundred cases conducted in the West Covina division. One hundred letters were sent to non custodial parents with arrears, as an invitation to contact the office and discuss payment plans. The response was small. Ms. Cruz stated that this effort is being handled internally and not in conjunction with the Judicial Counsel.

Chair Eisenberg suggested that Judicial Counsel should be involved; Ms. Cruz stated that they will be involved in the project. Ms. Cruz agreed to provide Chair Eisenberg with an in depth report of this subject in February. Vice Chair Speir requested a copy of the federal regulations in order to review; it appears as though non custodial parents are being reported delinquent because they aren't paying the 1.7% calculated amount. Ms. Cruz stated that non custodial parents are reported for having an arrears account, regardless of the amount paid each month. Mr. Golightly clarified that on the non custodial parents credit report, a notation that the non custodial parents is paying as agreed will be included.

Member Brass shared his personal experience; his TRW showed that he was 90 days late despite the fact that he made timely payments each month. Mr. Golightly stated that this was a credit bureau issue. Vice Chair Speir stated that the Board should focus on how NCPs are being reported-whether or not they have been appropriately assigned a 93; Mr. Golightly replied that the State has control of that issue. Vice Chair Speir and Member Brass will be reporting this issue to the state advocate board that they are members of and reporting back to CSAB. Member Cohen suggested that the state advocate board to which Member Brass and Vice Chair Speir belong could help enact change by placing more pressure on the state; Vice Chair Speir replied that more of the representatives need to be educated about the issue before that will occur.

**FUTURE MEETINGS: DISCUSS WHETHR THE BOARD SHOULD MEET IN  
DECEMBER - Lucy Eisenberg**

A motion was made by Member John Murrell to suspend the December meeting of CSAB. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Speir and unanimously carried.

**REPORT ON SAMPLE OF CASES WITH ARREARS OWING AT THE TIME  
THE ORDER IS ENTERED- Gail Juiliano**

Members of the Board were concerned with the legality of having orders entered 90 days after the date of service with arrears already owing. Ms. Juiliano conducted a sample of cases with arrears owing at the time of order.

- The sample included 30 cases. Three cases (10%) in the “order after hearing” category had a date that looked inappropriate to the reviewer.

Ms. Cruz stated that a local child support agency can only request retroactivity if the non custodial parent is served with the summons and complaint (S&C) within 90 days of the date of filing. If service falls outside of that date retroactivity can only go back to date of service.

Vice Chair Speir expressed concern about non custodial parents starting out with arrears due to the time lapse. Vice Chair Speir request that the Board review the amount of arrears at time the order was entered (for the sample 30 cases) as opposed to whether the time frame was appropriate. Ms. Juiliano responded there are very specific regulations relative to expedited processing. Los Angeles has been in compliance with these procedures for the past 4 years. The requirement is that 75% of cases need to obtain an order within 6 months and 90% of cases within 12 months.

Chair Eisenberg verified the three steps involved in the process of obtaining and order

1. A complaint is filed
2. The S&C is served
3. The order is entered

Mr. Golightly noted that since Ms. Juiliano and staff identified that there was a 10% questionable case rate, they are now charged with determining the source of the problem, examining whether it is it a court issue, internal policy issue, training issue or other issue.

At the request of Chair Eisenberg, Ms. Juiliano agreed to provide data from the 30 cases regarding the amount of time between the date S&C was served to the day the order was entered and the amount of arrears owed

In response to Member Brass’s inquiry about how parents are instructed regarding steps they may take to expedite obtaining a court order or how to proceed after being served, Ms. Cruz stated that they provide non custodial parents with a one page fact sheet explaining their legal rights. Member Cohen

and Member Brass requested to see the sheet, which Ms. Cruz agreed to send in order to get feedback.

### **DISCUSSION OF PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN-Gail Juiliano**

The draft of the performance improvement plan was distributed electronically in October 2006.

Strategy 1- Chair Eisenberg commented on the ambiguity of strategy 1, related to case management default orders. Ms. Juiliano stated that it was included at the request of the state but agrees that it appears to be redundant.

Strategy 2- Chair Eisenberg requested that at a future meeting information be provided highlighting the criteria has been established for modification and what procedures are in place for making those modifications. Ms. Cruz clarified that this strategy addresses cases that are current with arrears or owing arrears only and no payment has been made.

Vice Chair Speir posed a question about strategy review and adjustment. TANF and GR are not indicated in the plan; Vice Chair Speir asked if there is a task that detects if the non custodial parent is receiving aid. Ms. Juiliano replied that no task exist for that purpose; however during routine case reviews and adjustments case workers do check the database to determine whether a non custodial parent is on aid or incarcerated.

Chair Eisenberg asked whether the plan is likely to undergo many changes by the State and an approximation of when it will be finalized. Ms. Juiliano stated that according to a conversation with Ms. Mary Lawrence, the plan is close to being approved. Chair Eisenberg requested see data on how well the department is meeting monthly requirements and Ms. Juiliano agreed to provide a quarterly report in April 2007.

Vice Chair Speir commented on the rate of denied COAP applications. Vice Chair Speir suggested that the high rate of denials could possibly be attributed to an employee training issue and perhaps some applications were mistakenly denied. Vice Chair Speir asserted that after ensuring proper training of case workers, the department should send a letter to the denied applicants notifying them of their eligibility to reapply one year from their previous application. Mr. Golightly noted that the letters will have to be created manually. The letters will be sent to those applicants who applied after December 2005 into the future.

### **REPORT OF CIVIL CONTEMPT CASES- Emy Tzimoulis**

The civil contempt project was formed with a goal to increase collections. The objective is to collect money and establish payment plans. Ms. Emy Tzimoulis reported that:

- The department has implemented a program where support staff reviewed cases that had no payment, with an active address and the ability to pay. These cases were referred to an attorney and reviewed to determine whether or not to file a civil contempt case.

Mr. Wayne Doss clarified for the Board that civil contempt differs from criminal contempt in that civil contempt case records can be purged if the defendant pays whatever amount is owed.

- Ms. Tzimoulis presented statistics from March 2006- October 2006. There were 121 cases set.

18 cases resulted in a lump sum being paid in court, totaling = \$22, 342.

17 cases resulted in a payment plan being established in court.

15 cases began paying prior to the court date.

90 cases were taken off the calendar for various reasons. 51 of these cases couldn't be processed because the person was not personally served.

Member Brass suggested that the high number of cases taken off the calendar were related to a service issue. Vice Chair Speir suggested reviewing where the service attempts are made (home versus the workplace).

Mr. Golightly explained that this plan was piloted last year, and is not viewed as an effective tool for increasing collections. A major strategy point of this plan is that the prospect of a court appearance might inspire the non custodial parent to contact CSSD to work a payment plan out. Ms. Cruz stated that having the public defender involved has proved to be an obstacle because the public defender often advises people to go to the hearings or on ways to avoid the contempt as opposed to advising them to pay. Mr. Golightly clarified that the point of this project was to avoid going to court and instead to meet with non custodial parents to devise a payment plan.

**DATA/ BENCHMARKS ON CASES CREATED, WORKER'S  
COMPENSATION PAYMENTS AND INCREASED COLLECTIONS DURING**

**FY 2005-2006- Wayne Doss**

Mr. Wayne Doss provided a chart illustrating data on the worker's compensation payment campaign:

- Campaign # 3 concluded in October 2006. The objective was to double collections from workers' compensation. The Campaign was successful; the collections for the federal fiscal year ending September 30, 2006 were 102% higher than from the same time previous year. Following the transition to the State Disbursement Unit (SDU) in May, the Campaign discovered that many workers' compensation payments were incorrectly attributed to other sources by SDU staff. This complicated the process of verifying progress against the objective. To ensure that workers' compensation payments were properly identified, staff individually reviewed and validated hundreds of payments processed by the SDU each month from May to through September. This was a painstaking and time consuming process. Errors were shared with SDU staff to assist them to correctly identify workers' compensation cases in the future.
- Campaign # 4's goal is to decrease the time taken to open cases. Mr. Doss last reported on this project in August 2006. One of the problems that has been identified is the transfer of cases from local offices to the Central Intake Division. The CID is opening cases in a timely manner, but they are very often up close to the 20 day deadline. The division has had to invest in overtime to meet the deadline and the goal is to now get ahead of the 20 day time frame. A baseline analysis conducted in August illustrated that the CID received cases after two weeks. Beginning December 4, 2006, the following strategies will be implemented to shorten this time frame:
  1. An automation effort in conjunction with Ms. Lorraine Cain's unit- to move county applications along more expeditiously.
  2. A pilot will be conducted in three divisions dealing with non-welfare cases to help track these cases more accurately.

Internal changes have been instituted regarding how cases should be sent. As opposed to performing quality control measures on 100% of cases, there will be a sample taken, in order to decrease the delay of the majority of applications from being forwarded. Mr. Doss will report to the Board in February with the results of these modifications. Mr. Doss stated that the ideal solution, which is currently being explored, is to send applications digitally to the Central office.

**REPORT ON MONITORING EFFECTIVENESS OF EARLY INTERVENTION-  
Wayne Doss**

Mr. Doss reported that:

There has been a change of internal procedures and early intervention being conducted on wage assignment follow-up with employers. The program went into effect in November; Mr. Doss requested that he be allowed to report on the effectiveness in February in order to monitor the program for at least three months.

**REPORT ON CSSD WORKGROUP REGARDING CUSTOMER SERVICE - Steven Golightly**

Mr. Golightly will provide a full report of the outcome the workgroup at the January 2007 meeting of CSAB.

The workgroup, established in November 2006, is comprised of 15 employees representing six offices. This group will focus on customer service in the lobby of public contact offices and that of public service teams. Each public service office, according to Mr. Golightly observations, appeared to have a different set of protocols and procedures. Mr. Golightly recommended a universal procedure for all offices in order to standardize the quality of customer service. The workgroups will be divided into three teams to operate as follows:

1. Policies and Procedures- this group is charged with making recommendations for a consistent set of procedures for each office.
2. Physical Plant Set Up-, this group will focus on the appearance of each office, including rugs, children play areas, posted information and windows.
3. Training Needs- this group will observe whether or not special training is needed for customer service agents and make recommendations on what sort of training is needed.

January 15, 2007 is the deadline for the final report of recommendations to include short, medium and long-term goals. Mr. Golightly will give a full report and break down of the types of issues that bring people into CSSD offices and referrals to ombudsmen.

**Public Comment**

No Public Comment was made.

**Matters not posted on the Agenda (to be presented and placed on a future Agenda)**

There were no matters to be placed on future Agendas.

Chair Eisenberg declared the meeting adjourned at 12:05 PM